

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,194	09/08/2003	Hisayasu Nakao	1046.1299	8380
21171 STAAS & HA	7590 10/12/2010 LSEYLLP	)	EXAMINER HAMZA, FARUK	
SUITE 700				
1201 NEW YO WASHINGTO	ORK AVENUE, N.W. ON DC 20005		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
***************************************	11, 15 0 20000		2442	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/12/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/656,194	NAKAO, HISAYASU		
Examiner	Art Unit		
FARUK HAMZA	2442		

	FARUK HAMZA	2442	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 01 October 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	RALLOWANCE	
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Ciperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of a eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION, See MPEP 706.07(f)	lvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date in have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period to studied and the state of the stat	n which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 ension and the corresponding amount of nortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with</li> </ol>	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>			
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further con</li> <li>They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> </ol>	sideration and/or search (see NOT /);	E below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bette	er form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying th	ne issues for
appeal; and/or  (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a concern NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (f	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allow non-allowable claim(s).		•	
7. Solution of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an ex	planation of
Claim(s) allowed: <u>None</u> . Claim(s) objected to: <u>None</u> .			
Claim(s) rejected: 1.3-11.14.16-19.21.22.27.29-37.40.42-4 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.	8,53,55-63,66 and 68-74.		
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	hafara as an the data of filing a Nie	tion of Annualill not	he entered
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to ov showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	ercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•	
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>		condition for allowan	ce because:
<ul><li>12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (I</li><li>13.  Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Faruk Hamza/	-11.0440	
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2442	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the remarks the applicant argues in substance that, A) The instant specification provide support for claim limitation "showing a responding procedure of how to respond to a test mail according to a destination, to a user" on page 15, lines 18-19 and shown in Figs. 1,3.4 and 5.

In response to A) The examiner respectfully disagree with the applicant. The examiner carefully reviewed cited figures and portion of the specification found no support for this claim limitation. The cited portion of the specification merely recites "sends test mail for checking the validity of the mail address of the forward destination." There is no teaching for showing responding procedure or steps how to respond. Kubik teaches how to validate a destination address of a test mail (see Column 5, lines 32-46). Therefore, Kubik's teaching of validating destination address meets the claim limitation.

B) Kubik does not teach "accepting a setting request of a forward destination address corresponding to a receipt address of an E-mail addressed to the receipt address and the E-mail being to be forwarded to the forward destination address."

In response to B) The applicant is reminded that claim limitation must be given their reasonable broadest interpretation. Kubik teaches validating or testing a destination or recipient address prior to sending a message. In order to test the address, existing header is extended to include a test header. The test header allows a sender to test an e-mail address without sending the message (see Column 5, lines 21-46). Therefore, Kubik's teaching updating header by including test header to test address without sending message meets the claim limitation.